Date: Sun, 16 May 93 05:30:26 PDT
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #591
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Sun, 16 May 93 Volume 93 : Issue 591

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 16 May 93 04:42:22 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Buy back 11 Meters
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Eric KB6LUY suggested buying the 11-meter band. At first blush it's
a pleasant thought. However, what to do with the current occupants??
We seem to be having enough trouble keeping them off the 10-meter
band. Can you imagine what it would be like to run them off "their"
band??? It's one of those good ideas that is impractical (if not
impossible) to achieve.

73,
Dube AB5AP <dube@cpdvax.csc.ti.com>

Date: 16 May 93 01:14:04 GMT

From: pacbell.com!amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@ames.arpa
Subject: CFV to reorganize this group
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:
>ikluft@uts.amdahl.com (Ian Kluft) writes:
>:
>: I think we're still miscommunicating on something here. It is possible to
>: abstain on a single newsgroup while casting votes for the ones you have an
>: opinion on. The ballot form in the CFV allows for separate votes on each

>   Can you imagine anyone in r.r.a.* that doesn't have an opinion on
>anything? ;-).

Sigh... This *is* UseNet. I know what you mean...
--
Ian Kluft KD6EUI PP-ASEL   Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development
ikluft@uts.amdahl.com   Santa Clara, CA
[disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only... not those of my employer]

Date: Sat, 15 May 1993 17:42:30 GMT
From: spool.mu.edu!clark!pacifier!mikef@uunet.uu.net
Subject: CFV to reorganize this group
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <C6xAy6.1ux@ucdavis.edu> ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd)
writes:
>:
>I was going to vote no as well. I guess I wasn't following the thread
>closely enough though because I didn't realize we were voting on each
>group individually in the CFV. This works out much better. I did vote no
>on most of the groups but space, homebrew and instruction got a yes vote.
>
That's the way.

Wonder, though, if everyone will vote for his/her favorite aspect of the
obby, nixing or abstaining on voting for those groups he/she is not
interested in? Further, if this happens, will we end up like the
parliaments in some country where nothing passes and governments
rise and fall with the sun because no one can put together a
majority on anything? :-) :-) :-)
--
Mike Freeman | Amateur Radio Callsign: K7UIJ
301 N.E. 107th Street | Internet: mikef@pacifier.rain.com
Vancouver, WA 98685 USA | GEnie: M.FREEMAN11
Telephone (206)574-8221 | Pushing 40 is exercise enough!

Date: 16 May 93 01:03:28 GMT
From: pacbell.com!amdahl!amdahl!ikluft@ames.arpa
Subject: CFV to reorganize this group
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

k2ph@cbnewsj.cb.att.com (The QRPer) writes:
>From article <f0zC03YNd1Wm00@amdahl.uts.amdahl.com>, by ikluft@uts.amdahl.com (Ian Kluft):
>> If you don't see the need for a specific newsgroup, you can abstain from
>> voting on it. Someone else did see the need and was able to convince others
>> of its merits.

>Or you could vote NO if they were unable to convince you!

You're free to vote as you choose. The only argument here was when someone else said that an abstention was somehow equivalent to a yes. Several of us have brought up numbers to show that we believe that is not true.

Then again... in any vote or election, people often view any option that is not their choice as against them. I'm just trying to argue against changing the perceived definition of an abstention.

Abstaining on any given newsgroup means you do not cast a vote for or against it. That leaves the results to be determined by the people who did have an opinion on it. In order to pass, each separate proposed newsgroup must obtain at least a 2/3 majority and the yes votes have to outnumber the no votes by 100.

If you have an opinion on any given newsgroup, you SHOULD vote yes or no as appropriate. I encourage everyone to vote. In case you missed the CFV, I set up a mail-reply program after several people asked me for copies. Just send a message to cfv-request@uts.amdahl.com and it will send you a copy of the official CFV as posted by the moderator of news.announce.newgroups.
--
Ian Kluft KD6EUI PP-ASEL Amdahl Corporation, Open Systems Development
ikluft@uts.amdahl.com Santa Clara, CA
[disclaimer: any opinions expressed are mine only... not those of my employer]

Date: 15 May 93 22:59:52 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!wupost!csus.edu!netcom.com!btoback@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: DJ580 mods?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Since the last time I bought a VHF/UHF radio (a Standard C21 in
1983, a year before my licence lapsed), a lot has changed. It appears
that today's handhelds are a lot more capable, given a few modifications.

I've about decided, on the strength of a number of recommendations,
to buy an Alinco DJ-580. (My new ticket should be in the mail by
now.) Does anyone know if the DJ-580 can be modified to transmit on the
aircraft band?

WAIT! Before you get out the flamethrower (which a number of people
did when I originally asked for aircraft-capable radio suggestions),
I'd like the xmit capability for emergency IFR use. It'll be
used only close to the terminal area, where the signal will
be strong enough to slope-detect on ATC receivers.
Yes, I know it's not type-accepted, but in an emergency,
I'm not going to care, and given the most likely emergency scenarios,
I'd rather spend the money on a battery-powered GPS than on a "real"
aircraft-band handheld. (I'd rather have guaranteed good navigation
and "iffy" communication than "probably-good" communication and
"iffy" navigation.)

Thanks,
-- Bruce Toback

Date: Sat, 15 May 1993 14:04:13 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!mooch!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: no-code defense
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

jackhill@jackatak.raider.net (Jack GF Hill) writes:

>> Well the ARRL did not support no-code for the longest time and I have
>> oodles of QST ariticles to prove it. Then they did an about face
>> because of the $$$. ARRL does not represent a majority of hams anyway.
>   ^^^^ ^^^^ ^^^ ^^^^^^^^^ ^ ^^^^^^^^ ^^ ^^^^ ^^^^^^
> Well, Mr. O, it seems you have a great deal to learn about the
> workings of the rest of the world, outside the rather tightly and
> hermetically sealed state of mind called Rhode Island. Had you stated
> your premise that the majority of licensed US hams were not members of
> the American Radio Relay League, you'd have been correct.

Wrong you are! I stated that perfectly. Yes the ARRL may be the only
defacto representative body. But the fact still remains that the ARRL
does NOT represent a majority of amateurs. I have lived in several
states my friend. Two of which are New Hampshire and Maryland. I have
also traveled abroad. I DO have much knowledge (increasingly more) of

the "outside" world.

> However, as
> far as the Federal Government (US) and the various International
> Governments who collectively make the world-wide rules... The ARRL
> *IS* the representative body for US Amateur Radio. Hands down. No
> arguement. NO COMPETITION. The ARRL is THE representative body.

A competitive body is not necessarily the answer. However keep in mind that the ARRL is a BUSINESS. They are a publishing house. PERIOD. No ARGUMENT THERE! They represent themselves and their business. Yes I have supported things the ARRL has taken a stance on. However they put thier publishing business first on the no-code issue.

> As an Old Buzzard, who has been around this pole a helluva lot more
> often than you have in your tender 24 years on the planet, I think you
> are way off base,

So because you are an "old buzzard" means your facts are valid. WRONG! I have researched the topic and know personally many many hams who have been licensed before incentive licensing. I incorporate their opinions as part of my statements. In my "tender" 24 years on this planet I have done more than many other "old buzzards".

> go broader...out of
> RI... ask LOTS of hams who have been licensed since BEFORE the
> incentive licensing program nearly made us all extinct...and check
> your percentages again.

Already answered.

> ...closely...people with memories and no desire
> to repeat the stupidity of 1968 are pretty well in favor of the
> licensing scheme that permits licenses without a CW requirement...

Maybe in your circle of friends you actually believe this to be true. Incentive? Oh my gosh. We can't have that "stupidity" now. It's too hard. Well your breed has helped to make American psyche weak. Gimme Gimme Gimme.

> that these new hams are upgrading, at the rate of nearly 2 of every 3,
> should take a great deal of the arguement out of you.

You just killed your previous statement that incentive was stupidity. If in fact 2 out of 3 no-code beginners do upgrade to a coded status then the incentive DID work. But didn't you say that was stupidity?

> ... but like so

> many who like to believe they are educated because of a college
> degree... you will no doubt sputter on, further proving ignorance is
> no filter for anything...

Yes college did provide me with a basis of education which I have
continued to build on. But like so many who believe they are educated
becuase they are an "old buzzard", you will no doubt sputter on proving
ignorance is no filter for anything. See...it goes both ways doesn't
it? Rememeber a man without an education is NOTHING! I hope you are
more than that? I am educated because I collect, analyze, and formulate
my own ideas, then I test them. I aim to do this for every facet of my
life. College helped me to develop the skills necessary to accomplish
this.

You see Jack, I love this lively debate. I may respect other people's
views but I have have my own which often differ with other PC people.

- Christopher Ogren NM1Z | The politically correct -
- system@mooch.sbs.com | term for no-codes is   -
- AMPRnet: nm1z@switch.w1cg-9 | "Morsely Challenged".   -
-                [44.104.0.2] | -
- AX25net: NM1Z@KA1RCI.RI.USA.NA | MPD   -

Date: Sat, 15 May 1993 10:52:51 EST
From: anomaly.sbs.com!mooch!news@uunet.uu.net
Subject: no-code defense
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

ez006683@othello.ucdavis.edu (Daniel D. Todd) writes:

>   As has been pointed out a number of times before, specifically by
> Dana and Todd, the treaty doesn't require any speed standard nor even a
> cnversational level of competency in Morse code. Second, it doesn't
> require any code requirement, it recommends one but any signatory can opt
> out by filing a waiver.

True there exists no speed requirment in an international sense.
Actually these are International Agreements. International Law is a
very gray area. There does not really exist any true enforcing body.
The UN may be construed by some in this way but it is more of a political
body. I suppose code could fall under the Laws of the Seas which are
infact International Law. But I am not sure on that. International
Agreements were more loosely writtne so that each state could set
certain standards which they felt were appropriate. But the fact still
stands that Morse Code according to the international community is still

an important means on communication on the HF frequencies. The IARU
just reaffirmed this too.

> I didn't realize it wsa against the unwritten code to help other amateurs
> with solder jobs etc that they are unable to do for themselves.

You missed the point entirely. It is one thing to help an amatuer with
a solder job. I often do this myself. But he was making a point that
it is a sad state of affairs when an amateur cannot even put a connector
on coax. IT IS NOT DIFFICULT! This should be able to be accomplished
by any license class right down to novice. Geez, get an ARRL handbook
and follow it's intructions for putting on a connector. It is pretty
clear if you can read English. Mybe they are nervous of messing up but
that's ok too. That's how a person can learn sometimes...by their
mistakes. It's not like coax is very expensive.

JJust yesterday on my way to work I was listening to two amateurs talk
about mulit-mode data controllers. One was affraid to install his new
MFJ 1278 because he couldn't figure out how to make a cord for keying
the tx or receiving audio. Now come on folks. That is really sad. It
is very very very basic. Any amateur (in theory) should be able to
accomplish such a task. But in true "modern" amateur fashion he is
going to opt for the "pre-made" MFJ cord. I can't blame MFJ, they are
just providing a product where there there is a market for it. Just
READ people. That's all I ask.

> Gee there really are some extras on 2mtrs. :-)   There are people that
> don't know much about electronics of all license classes. Help teach them.
> Quit yer whining.

This is also very true. Thanks to the joke exams and the inability of
hams to read and LEARN. It's like the minute some people get an extra
class license, they think they are all done now. It should be only the
beginning. One's education is never over.

> Many people are violently against the right thing look at the freedom
> riders in the south. I'm not drawing a direct comparison but realize that
> just because a majority of a group want something to happen means that is
> the right thing.

OH really! I would have to disagree with you there. So you could also
justify that argument in South Africa. Couldn't you? Being that we are
a democracy what the "people" want is always the RIGHT thing. Whether
or not that causes harm to ourselves at some point is of lesser
importance. We cause more harm to ourselves by abandoning our belief
in majority rule.

> I would bet that if the FCC gave some people authority to do something

> about the problems they would get better, especially if the Hams were
> given privledges there again. That way we'd out number the lids. And a
> few pink slips and some good RDF cleans the bands up pretty well.

I can agree with you there. The FCC has a very hands off approach to
the amateur radio service. There is some token involvement but it is
very rare. If we are to be self policing we need some teeth in OO's
authorities. Nobody likes lids.

You made one point which I failed to quote. But yes, Better ELMERS
would mean better New Amateurs. DOing a favor for a ham friend is one
thing, ie coaxial connector, but you need to teach them how to do it
themselves for the next time.

It seems a bunch of people think SBS sites only bash. We practice what
we preach here in RI. We are part of an 2 meter FM code practice net
and also work with the Ocean State Amateur's Net which attempts to
answer any and all questions amteurs have regarding policy, theory, or
operating tips. We especially encourage new amateur's to check in every
week. Yes, we unsing SBS sites might seem critical but we practice what
we preach!   I am not some P.C. wishy washy ham who likes to see things
going down the toilet like they are.


```
-----------------------------------------------------------------
-  Christopher Ogren NM1Z           |  The politically correct -
-  system@mooch.sbs.com             |  term for no-codes is    -
-  AMPRnet: nm1z@switch.w1cg-9      |  "Morsely Challenged".   -
-                [44.104.0.2]       |                          -
-  AX25net: NM1Z@KA1RCI.RI.USA.NA   |                 MPD      -
-----------------------------------------------------------------
```

Date: 15 May 93 11:58:47 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!caen!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!
cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!ukma!netnews.louisville.edu!wkuvx1!baconta@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Radio Shack 70cm HT?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993May14.173042.10110@peavax.mlo.dec.com>,
coulson@rwcvax.enet.dec.com (Roger Coulson) writes:
>
> In article <1993May14.151046.22174@newsgate.sps.mot.com>,
markm@bigfoot.sps.mot.com (Mark Monninger) writes:
> |>Newsgroups: rec.radio.amateur.misc
> |>From: markm@bigfoot.sps.mot.com (Mark Monninger)
> |>Subject: Radio Shack 70cm HT?
> |>Organization: SPS

> |>Date: Fri, 14 May 1993 15:10:46 GMT
> |>Lines: 6
> |>
> |>I saw a packet posting yesterday about a Radio Shack 70cm HT. Supposedly
> |>they are starting to sell them. The poster gave a model number and a
> |>price...$299.95. Sounded like a 70cm version of the 2M one. Anyone here
> |>know anything about it?
> |>
> |>Mark   AA7TA
> |>
>
> Radio Shack is now carrying a two channel 1 watt GMRS HT. It is on 2 of the
> 462 MHZ interstitial channels. It is carrier squelch only. It is xtal
> controlled. It is definitely NOT suitable for amateur service.
>

The radio that Mark is talking about is a new 70cm HT. I recently saw
a blurb in a magazine under the "New Products" section. It does sound
like a 70cm version of the 2M radio. The price they gave however, was
around $260.00, just like the 2M. The article didn't offer very much
information on this radio or when it will be available.

Tim   KD4WBZ

> --
> Roger Coulson WA1NVC
>
> (Easynet)   RWCVAX::Coulson
> (UUCP)   {decvax, ucbvax, allegra}!decwrl!rwcvax.dec.com!coulson
> (Internet)   coulson@rwcvax.dec.com
> (BITNET)   coulson%rwcvax.dec@decwrl.ARPA
> (Telephone) (508) 493-6158
>
> (US MAIL)   Digital Equipment Corporation
>   146 Main Street   MS: MLO5-5/T49
>   Maynard, MA 01754
>
> ---
> Disclaimer: Views expressed herein are my own and do not necessarily
>   reflect those of my employer.
> ---

Date: Sat, 15 May 1993 13:42:32 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!hellgate.utah.edu!caen!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!
howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@network.UCSD.EDU
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <9305121559.AA00688@ginzo.wellfleet>,
<1993May13.152617.20016@cs.cornell.edu>, <BAT.93May14150113@gdstech.GRUMMAN.COM>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: question about Radio Shack 2-MTR HT

In article <BAT.93May14150113@gdstech.GRUMMAN.COM> bat@gdstech.GRUMMAN.COM (Pat
Masterson) writes:
> You guys are bemoaning your computer interference to your
>HTs with ducky antennas. Gary, and the other people are telling
>you to use a real (outside, and high) antenna to cure that problem.
>It will. And, it will cure a problem that you are causing me (and
>other packeteers). The dreaded HIDDEN TRANSMITTER problem.
> If you are close enough to the BBS to get into it on an HT with
>a ducky, then you probably cant hear most of the distant packet
>stations in your region. And, they can't hear you, either.
>But, the BBS, with its high antenna, hears us both, and often
>at the SAME TIME. The result is, that neither your packets, or mine,
>are decoded, and both systems go into backoff/retry mode.
> Throughput degrades. We all lose. The solution is for ALL antennas
>to be high, and transmitters running 20 watts minimum. (easy for me,
>I'm rich). In packet, the ideal state is for all the systems to be
>able to hear ALL the other ones on the frequency (within realistic
>limits). Please do what you can to contribute to the health of the
>system as a whole, and not just concern yoursef with your own
>situation. -pat

Pat's right in his description of the problem. His proposed solution
is *one* approach to solving it. Another approach is to eliminate
the hidden terminals via a duplex repeater (like voice) so everyone
hears what the repeater hears. If you can get a repeater per MAN
coordinated, this works great. A third approach is to eliminate the
exposed terminals, the high sites, and have *everyone* run low
power and low antennas. This quasi-cellular approach requires many
more relay hops for the typical circuit, and assumes a packet station
density far greater than in many areas, and a 24 hr on air time for
every station, but it can work too if the network is planned carefully.
Network latency is higher however.

The *worst* situation is simplex high sites combined with HT and poor
antenna low sites. This is packet hell for everyone trying to use the
channel.

Gary

--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary
Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 | |

Date: Sat, 15 May 1993 13:28:24 GMT
From: agate!howland.reston.ans.net!gatech!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary@ames.arpa
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <930421130108@nauvax.ucc.nau.edu>, <103360181@hpfcso.FC.HP.COM>,
<930514132117@nauvax.ucc.nau.edu>
Reply-To : gary@ke4zv.UUCP (Gary Coffman)
Subject : Re: What is circular polarization?

In article <930514132117@nauvax.ucc.nau.edu> cvm@zippy.telcom.arizona.edu (Chris
Michels) writes:
>I am suprised how many responses there have been to this question. (I
>started this thread almost two months ago).
>
>There have been many good explanations of circular polarization, but I
>am still wondering why circular polarization is used. I have heard a
>couple of explanations:
>
>1 - Cirular polarization is just the result of satellites spinning and
>has no real benefit.
>
>2 - Circular polarization is intentional and allows ground stations to
>not worry about the polarization of their antenna because the circular
>polarized signal will be oriented acceptably at least 50% of the time.
>
>Which of these (if either) are true.
>
>More questions, how does using a circularly polarized antenna help. If
>#2 above is true, then it a fixed polarized antenna would be acceptable.
>If this is not true, then how does a circularly polarized antenna know
>at what rate and orientation to spin the polarization. Does the
>polarization make one reveloution per wave or does it not matter? It
>seems that if the polarization of the signal and the receiving antenna
>were changing at the same rate but were 90 degrees out of phase, then
>the signal would be missed/lost.

Advantages of circular polarization, in no particular order.

Less crosspolarization loss when working with linear polarized
signals on the other end. You can suffer as much as 30 db cross

polarization loss between two linear polarized antennas if one
is 90 degrees to the other (IE horizontal and vertical). If one
of the antennas is a CP antenna, then the loss is only 3 db. A
way to view CP is two right angle polarized vectors with equal
strength. So there's 3 db less horizontal than a HP signal, and
3 db less vertical than a VP signal. Absolute phase doesn't matter
to LP antennas. Of course there's *always* a 3 db loss compared to
two antennas which are *not* cross polarized when one of the antennas
is CP and the other is not. With a spinning satellite, this is usually
a big win since ilinear polarization would be continously changing
with spin. If both ends use CP of the same sense, minimum losses
are incurred.

A related topic; spin modulation. If linear polarization is used,
a spinning satellite's signals will be amplitude modulated by the
spin rate due to the varying cross polarization loss mentioned
above. This will result in a very annoying pumping of the satellite's
signal at a low audio rate. If both ends use CP of the same handedness,
then the spin modulation will disappear (assuming both antennas are
boresighted, if not, squint angle enters in and introduces elliptical
polarization to the signals). Note that CP signals "revolve" in phase
every cycle of the waveform. That's millions of times faster than
the spin of the satellite so that if the antenna senses match, the
only result of the satellite's *mechanical* rotation is a *tiny* phase
modulation of the signal much too slight to detect.

Another advantage of circular polarization is reduction of multipath
problems, or ghosting as we call it in the TV business. When a CP
signal is reflected, it's "handedness" reverses. (IE a right hand
circular signal will become a left hand circular signal when reflected)
Because signals of different polarization sense, handedness in this
case, will suffer the 30 db cross polarization loss, this will reduce
the received strength of multipath signals (reduce ghosts). Note to
take advantage of this both antennas must be CP of the same sense.

In some cases, especially at microwave, a bounce signal may be the
strongest of the multiple signals reaching the receiver. In that case,
reversing the sense of the receive antenna will give better reception.
We take advantage of this a lot with mobile microwave relays of live
news events in urban areas. We often select a tall building and bounce
the signal off of it rather than trying to burn through the clutter with
a direct shot. Switchable polarization sense is a must. We can also
select horizontal or vertical polarization for the times we must
"knife edge" diffract over or around an obstacle.

Gary
--
Gary Coffman KE4ZV | You make it, | gatech!wa4mei!ke4zv!gary

Destructive Testing Systems | we break it. | uunet!rsiatl!ke4zv!gary
534 Shannon Way | Guaranteed! | emory!kd4nc!ke4zv!gary
Lawrenceville, GA 30244 |

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #591
****